

REMARKS

Summary of Claim Status

Claims 1, 3, and 6-16 are pending in the present application after entry of the present amendment. Claims 1-3 and 7-16 are rejected. Claims 4 and 6 are objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if properly rewritten in independent form. Claim 5 was previously deemed withdrawn and is now cancelled without prejudice.

Applicant requests the favorable reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the pending rejections and objections, in view of the present amendment and in light of the following remarks.

Restriction Requirement

Applicant affirms the provisional election of Group I, including Claims 1-4 and 6-16, with traverse. Applicant has cancelled non-elected Claims 5 and 17-60, but reserves the right to submit some or all of these claims in one or more divisional applications, without prejudice.

Rejections Under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 1, 9-10, 12, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Song et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,121,797, hereinafter Song). Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Allen et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,232,799, hereinafter Allen).

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include the limitations of Claim 4, which was deemed allowable, and intervening Claim 2. Therefore, Claim 1 is believed allowable. Claims 9-12 and 14-16 are believed allowable for at least the reasons of Claim 1, from which they depend.

Applicant has cancelled Claims 2 and 4 without prejudice as being redundant with newly amended Claim 1. Applicant has amended Claims 3 and 6 for correct dependency and for consistency with amended Claim 1.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 2-3 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Sako (U.S. Patent No. 6,084,437). Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Song in view of Young et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,768,338, hereinafter Young).

Claim 2 is cancelled as being redundant with newly amended Claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 2 is moot. Claims 3, 7-8, and 13 are believed allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons of Claim 1, from which they depend.

Although this point is now moot, Applicant respectfully draws to the Examiner's attention the fact that Young (U.S. Patent No. 6,768,338) is not valid prior art under 35 USC 103(a) with respect to the present application. As indicated at MPEP 706.02(l)(3), 35 USC 102(e), (f), and (g) do not apply through 35 USC 103 when common ownership has been established. The assignment documents filed with Young and with the present application evidence that both Young and the present application were assigned/subject to assignment to Xilinx, Inc., at the time the present invention was made.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 4 and 6 are objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim, but otherwise allowable. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this acknowledgement of allowable subject matter.


Applicant has amended Claim 1 to correspond to the original Claim 4. Therefore, and for at least these reasons, all pending claims are believed to be allowable.

Conclusion

No new matter has been introduced by any of the above amendments. All claims should now be in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If any action other than allowance is contemplated by the

Examiner, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone Applicant's agent, Lois D. Cartier, at 720-652-3733.

Respectfully submitted,




Lois D. Cartier
Agent for Applicant
Reg. No. 40,941

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as **first class mail** in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 26, 2005.

Pat Slaback

Name



Signature